UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Contributors to This Issue:

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST McAFEE
JEROME DAVIS
SYDNEY STRONG
REGINALD A. REYNOLDS
FRANK E. BAKER
LUCIA TRENT
LILLIAN BROWNE-OLF
ALICE STONE BLACKWELL
TARAKNATH DAS
CLARENCE M. GALLUP
DONALD GRANT
FREDERICK HANKINSON

VOLUME CIX NUMBER 12

Chicago, May 23, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 179
Wanted: A Chance for a New Religious Leadership—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 181
Jottings—J. H. H. 183

ARTICLES—
In Defense of Freedom—JEROME DAVIS 183
The Time for Total Disarmament Now—SYDNEY STRONG 185
Patriotism at 5%—REGINALD A. REYNOLDS 187
A Contrast—FRANK E. BAKER 187

POETRY—
Through Prison Doors—LUCIA TRENT 179
Sun Up!—LILLIAN BROWNE-OLF 187

THE STUDY TABLE—
Ireland Sheds Light on India—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL 188
The Myth of German War-Guilt—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 188
Extra-Territoriality in Japan—TARAKNATH DAS 189

CORRESPONDENCE—
Bankers and Veterans—CLARENCE M. GALLUP 190
Cheers for Tardieu—Silence for Litvinoff—DONALD GRANT 191

THE FIELD—
Englishmen Speak Up on India!—*India Bulletin* (London) 178
Visit to the Local Prison of Cluj, Transylvania—FREDERICK HANKINSON 178

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Englishmen Speak Up on India!

A meeting, organized by the "Friends of India," was held at Trafalgar Square on Saturday, April 9th. Notwithstanding the weather, the meeting was attended by about 500 people. Brig.-Gen. Crozier, C. B., C. M. G., D. S. O., was Chairman, and the speakers were Dr. V. H. Rutherford, M. A.; Mr. Robert O. Mennell; Mrs. Haidri Bhuttacharji; Mr. Atma Kamlani; and Mr. Syed Abdul Huck. The following resolution was put to the meeting and carried with only half a dozen dissenting votes:

"That this meeting protests against the futile and brutal methods of repression used by the British authorities in India, which only lead to reprisals (as in Ireland in 1920 and 1921), and demands the release of Mahatma Gandhi and his colleagues, in order that the chosen leaders of the Indian National Congress, representing the Indian people, may meet British representatives and work out a Treaty acceptable to the British and Indian peoples and thus enable India to devise her own constitution."

India Bulletin (London).

Visit to the Local Prison of Cluj, Transylvania

[From Our Special Correspondent]

In spite of the bad financial situation and the general trade depression in all the countries of central and eastern Europe, and allowing for the poverty and want which affect many of the middle and working classes, yet at the period of Christmas and New Year everyone who can puts on a brave and smiling face and determines to bring some cheer and happiness into the family life and into the lives of the poor and misfortunate, and also with the coming of the New Year the human heart feels it must look ahead with hope and trust for a better future. Amid the difficulties of the period and with social service not so highly developed as in more northern and western lands, there is not yet any highly organized welfare work for the despised and rejected of men, especially those in prisons. The wonderful work of the Prisoners' Aid Society has yet to be begun.

It was my pleasure to visit the town of Cluj this last December. There was an air of Christmas abroad and luckily prices in the actual country were very low. All kinds of home produced foods and fruits were remarkably low in price and Christmas trees—a feature of every home even if it is only a side branch—of all sizes and shapes filled the great market square, transforming it into a fairy forest and were sold for a very small sum. On this account there was an air of the holiday season, and walking along the streets, even the poorest, one saw at night through the windows gaily decorated and candle-lit trees

(*Continued on page* 191)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CIX MONDAY, MAY 23, 1932 Number 12

THROUGH PRISON DOORS

(On hearing of Governor Rolph's refusal of a pardon to Tom Mooney)

One man must suffer that the race may rise
Up thorny pathways into clearer skies;

One man become a stepping-stone for all
While his own century mocks his cup of gall,

While temporary masters once again
Thrust his brave figure toward the squalid pen.

And yet mankind leaps from his martyrdom
To that humanity which is to come.

Because its way leads through his prison door
The race grows greater than it was before!

LUCIA TRENT.

We Americans wonder why we are a lawless people! We might do worse than to examine the Massie case, if we want our wonder satisfied. Here were four defendants duly convicted of an outrageous lynching on the basis of evidence submitted in a court of law (see UNITY, May 16th). The jury acted from no prejudice, since no less than seven of the jurymen were Anglo-Saxons and only one a native Hawaiian. There were extenuating circumstances of motive which were duly recognized in the jury's plea to the judge for "leniency." Yet immediately upon the sentencing of the convicted murderers, the Governor of Hawaii, acting under pressure as terrific as it was disreputable, commuted the penalty of ten years to one hour, and then let the criminals go free. If such was to be the outcome of the case, why were Massie and his three associates ever arrested, or indicted, or tried? Why go through the motions of observing the law, only to flout it in the end? But this is not all of what took place in Honolulu! As though to make amends for what was done in the Massie case, resorting again to the old device of twisting two wrongs into the making of a single right, the prosecution of the four surviving alleged assailants of Mrs. Massie, with whose offense all this trouble began, was ordered abandoned. What could be worse than this as a defiance of law and a betrayal of justice? These four men are either innocent or guilty. If innocent, they should be acquitted and thus freed of all suspicion and blame. If guilty, they should be punished for their vile and cruel crime. As it is, all public interest is defied, and of course all public safety jeopardized, while the individual is encouraged anew to do what he will and "get away with it." Hence a lawlessness which must in the end, if it be not stayed, destroy all organized society! The sentimentality, the superstition, the hysteria of the American people passes all belief. So also does their utter selfishness. To take the law into our own hands and bend it to our own purposes, this is liberty!

Will the world distress get severe enough soon enough to bring about disarmament? That's the nub of the whole situation at Geneva. That the nations under normal conditions, or with any prospects of financial improvement in sight, will reduce their armies and navies is of course incredible. The one thing the Disarmament Conference has accomplished is a demonstration of the fact that no government in the world, with the possible exception of Soviet Russia, has any intention of relinquishing arms deemed necessary to national security or to maintenance of national interests. That is, if they can find the money! But it is just this business of finding the money which is becoming increasingly difficult. Look at what is happening here in the United States! For years the pacifists, and sensible citizens generally, have been trying to stop the increasing militarization of our civic life. They have pointed out the ridiculous and costly excess of officers over enlisted men in the army; they have enveighed against the Reserve Officers Training Corps in our universities and colleges; they have opposed the summer Military Training Camps. But all in vain! But now, suddenly, under the impact of the economy campaign in Washington, the House Committee on Military Affairs brings in a report which calls for the retirement from active service of 2,000 army officers, and the abolition of the R. O. T. C. and the C. M. T. C. There's no money for these luxurious debauches, and so they disappear. The same happy result may be achieved at Geneva, if only the financial crisis becomes black enough. Not so black as to engulf us, for there is nothing gained in the elimination of armies and navies in the collapse of civilization itself! That would be the reproduction on a vast scale of the old tragedy of sinking the ship to drown the rats. But a crisis so acute as to force the savings on military expenditures which can alone avert

disaster! That's what we want—for so does God make the wrath of men to praise Him.

We have little sympathy for the "Bonus" grab. We go farther than this and say that we regard the attempt of the war veterans to use their far-flung political power to extort from the national government a gift of $2,000,000,000 as nothing more nor less than highway robbery. The bandit who "sticks up" his victim on a dark road and takes his watch and purse is doing only what these veterans are doing in their hold-up of Congress. The fundamental abomination, of course, is the payment of government money to any one selected group in the community, regardless of claim or need. To care for men maimed in the war, and for the dependents of those killed, is an elementary duty. But to offer bonuses and pensions to men who are perfectly well and strong, to millions of men who never saw a battlefield or shot a rifle, is nothing less than a crime. Yet there are moments, in our darker moods, when we can feel a certain satisfaction in these treasury raids. For this, dearly beloved friends, is the price of war. This is what it means when we pass a conscription law, invade by force and violence the homes of citizens and seize them as living sacrifices for the battlefield. We can see a certain crude justice in the demand of these victims of governmental brutality and tryanny that the nation be made to pay, *pay,* PAY for what it did to them in 1917-18. When Woodrow Wilson took us into the foul imperialistic struggle of arms in Europe, he saddled this country with a financial burden of bonuses and pensions which will not cease until this twentieth century has passed into the twenty-first. *We are being punished for our sins,* in this and a hundred other ways. It will be well to remember this fact when "the next war" comes in sight and another universal conscription bill is debated in Congress.

When the Supreme Court, by its famous 5 to 4 decision in the Macintosh case, declared that no alien could be admitted to citizenship in the United States if the applicant cherished any conscientious scruples against bearing arms in war, it outlawed conscience from the Union, and left the founder of the Christian faith unnaturalized into the life of the American people. The situation thus created, as abhorrent to every intelligent and open-minded citizen as it was to Chief Justice Hughes in his minority opinion, remains unalterable save by Congress, which can establish by law what had been fully established by custom until the Supreme Court handed down its amazing judgment. Ever since the establishment of the Republic, Quakers, Mennonites and other non-resistant believers have been freely admitted into citizenship without any demand that a promise to bear arms in event of war be exacted and registered. But now this dangerous practice has been duly outlawed, and only Congress can restore our rights of conscience. To accomplish this end, two bills have been introduced into Congress —the Griffin bill in the House, and the Cutting bill in the Senate—and both now await the support of righteous public sentiment. There is no possibility, in other words, of either one of these proposed acts being passed or even considered, unless the friends of freedom in church and state are heard from in no uncertain voice. The patrioteers of the nation, of course, are up in arms (a good phrase!) against these bills. The *Christian Century* declares that the American Legion has boasted that it has 25,000 speakers to throw into the public arena in opposition to such legislation. Discounting such braggadocio as we may, there still remains the sober fact of bitter and highly organized antagonism. It is a time for friends of this type of legislation to act. Write Senator David A. Reed and Representative Samuel Dickstein, chairmen of committees in charge.

Everything is "wet" here in America—until the voters go to the polls! Then curious things seem to happen. We have been told for weeks, now, that the next Congress would be "wet"—that every symptom of public opinion indicated the defeat of "dry" candidates and the election of "wet" candidates for the House of Representatives. Well, there were some little primary elections in Indiana the other day, and the New York *Times* honestly but sadly reports that "only eight of the twenty-four Congressional nominees can safely be called 'wet.'" At this rate of progress, the House will fall into the hands of the "wet" forces some time about 3000 A. D. There was a primary election in California on the same day as in Indiana. The dripping "Al" Smith, the darling of boozers everywhere, ran at the bottom of the Democratic poll. Roosevelt, "dry" and "wet" according to place and time, but under the New York influence pretty steadily veering toward the "wets," came trailing along well in the rear of Garner, a southern "dry." The latter's chief champion in California was none other than Mr. McAdoo, who is as arid as a camel, and now well in line for the Democratic candidacy for the United States Senate. In the State of Washington, a few days after the primaries, there came a test in Republican ranks. Here, in the State Convention, an attempt was made by delegates, who are under the propaganda illusion that Noah's flood is on the way, to insert a Prohibition repeal plank in the party platform. The result was the adoption of a strong plea for "strict enforcement of all laws." Says the Associated Press dispatch, "The Prohibition Amendment was not mentioned." So it goes! The "wet" sentiment in this country is triumphant in met-

ropolitan newspapers, in "swanky" social sets, in *Literary Digest* circulation campaigns, in certain industrial areas. But among the great masses of the common people throughout the nation, it does not prevail. Hold the fort! As the French cried at Verdun—*"They shall not pass!"*

The newspapers carried a front-page announcement the other day that two young English scientists, after years of study and experiment, had succeeded in achieving the miracle of splitting an atom. This has been the goal of physical science for many years, and may therefore be regarded as an event of the first order of importance. But how is its significance described in the public announcement? By a statement that the achievement at present disclosed no immediate commercial value, but such value might be discovered at any time. Here is one more illustration, to be added to innumerable others, of the utter prostitution of modern science to the sordid pursuits and ideals of our materialistic age. If a great discovery is made, the scientists immediately undertake to find out how it can be used for making private profits for some individual or group of individuals. If the discovery can be turned into millions of dollars, and thus be dedicated to the production of immense fortunes for millionaires, then it is a success; if, unhappily, the discovery has no money value, then it is thrown aside, and the scientist presses on to something more important. Apart from the field of medicine, a blessed exception, modern science has apparently two goals—first, to create war machines for the destruction of the human race; and, secondly, to make discoveries which will coin money for industrial magnates. That science should thus surrender itself to the worst in our contemporary life constitutes one of the supreme tragedies of this age. It was thought in former days, more innocent than our own, that natural science would save the world. We now see that this science is either ruining or utterly destroying the world. This is not the fault of science in itself. Rather is it the fault of men who have neither the moral character nor the spiritual vision to use aright the stupendous powers which God has committed to their charge.

Wanted: A Chance for a New Religious Leadership

We must do something more and better in religious leadership. The first requirement is fresh, vigorous, cooperative, constructive thinking. Organized religion is not getting much of anywhere. Few have confidence in the churches. Even community churches are manifestly not the answer to the new questions. There are said to be 2,000 community churches in the United States. Most of them are feeble imitations of denominational churches, and offer little hope of light and leading. The remainder are hopeful only because they do not delude themselves with false conceptions of their own sufficiency. They know that no church is the final word.

The old cults all survive, though the struggle for existence is often severe. The crowded field does not daunt new isms, however. They come on with bewildering fecundity. Each shade of modernism tends to produce its own cult. The fact that most of our moribund and decadent religious denominations were in their natal day liberal or radical cults does not seem to deter founders of the new, though each must be conscious if he thinks at all that his is destined to run the same futile course as those gone before. But shall not discriminating and unprejudiced spirits conclude once for all that our salvation will never come by cult, a new one or an old one, by many or by few? Have we not been fed up on creeds, on theological formulas, on intellectual movements, on "correct" beliefs and doctrines?

Does not our hope lie in laboratory experiments and demonstrations? Programs successfully operating in actual communities will show what religion is and is for. Nothing else will. Endless debate of personal mystical experiences, and of doctrines based upon them, must prove endless, indeed, and fruitless. In clarifying thought they have some value but they cannot make up the body of religion. If they shape motives and direct individual action they may serve a religious purpose, but in and of themselves they are not religious. If they exhaust themselves in generating intellectual cults and smug sects the whole experience of our American religious history must call down a plague upon them. Religion for today and tomorrow demands that we apply ourselves to the arts and tasks of community building, of fabricating the good society.

To do this we must make a new approach under a new type of leadership. The present leadership lives and moves and has its being in an atmosphere of seclusion and exclusion. It gets itself "ordained," "set apart" to a "sacred" office, calls itself "Reverend"! It preaches, and imposes an abstract moral code upon living men and women whose ethics, if true, must be forever in the making. It conducts worship wherein men and women are told what God is thinking about and wants done. It touches only with the tips of its fingers the great social problems of the day, having little or no first-hand knowledge, and having only the vaguest insights upon social realities. Is there not immediate and importunate demands for a religious leadership which will be and is none of these foolish things; which will take hold and guide at points

of real community need and action? Where is such leadership to come from and how is to get into service?

Furthermore, our present religious leaders live in and help to generate an atmosphere of division and schism. They are agents of permanently segregated groups. By reason of their training and their offices in the community they are incapable of leading in the great common purposes of the common life. If we are to have a religious life worthy of the name must not this factional leadership be set aside and leaders be raised up who refuse to be crippled and shackled by an ecclesiastical order? How shall the people in our communities be aroused to demand and support this new type of leadership?

This muddling is unjust to our American communities. They are shut up to the present type of ecclesiastical leadership and have been for so long that they lack the insights and initiative necessary to break away.

It is unjust to thousands of honest men who constitute the rank and file of our present religious leadership. They are in the grip of an ecclesiastical system which they did not create and against which they chafe with little or no hope of re-ordering.

It is unjust to recruits in colleges, universities and theological training schools, fired with aspiration to religious leadership, but whose only recourse is complacent acceptance of an impossible ecclesiastical system or else a single-handed rebellion against it which is usually as sad as it is futile.

How can this vicious circle be broken? How can courage and insight be infused into communities, into old leadership and new?

The break will probably come in the courageous action of one community, and then of a few communities, willing to pool the funds which they now expend with no satisfactory result in two, three or more meager ministerial salaries. The total may make up a salary adequate to support a capable leader of the type mentioned. He will not be an ordained clergyman. He will not preach, nor officiate as a priest. He will rather be an organizer, a resourceful executive. He will help the citizens to determine what common action is required to develop the highest spiritual interests of their common life. He and they will be hindered by no ecclesiastical traditions or prejudices from following any course and taking any action which will lead to the desired end. There will be no arbitrary lines drawn between the sacred and the secular. Much of the dead wood accumulated in the conventional religious program will simply be discarded. Religious exercises into which people now have to be prodded and scolded will be dropped and forgotten. Nothing perfunctory will go by the name of religion.

On the other hand, that which groups, even small groups, demand as providing the inspirations required for their highest efficiency as citizens will be supplied under the cordial cooperation of this leadership. Though not a priest himself, and though declining to identify himself with any priestly functions, this leader will help to make it easy for any group to follow its own religious ritual. He will defend rather than oppose the older generation, however tradition-bound, in the exercise of their religious rights. He will only insist upon religious liberty. He will not lend his aid to any kind of doctrinal propaganda, and of course he will resist all religious persecution or compulsion, either a dominant sect, or of the older generation in its relations with the young.

He will be neither a liberal nor a conservative in theology. He will not presume to prescribe what is "correct" in personal responses to religious "truth." None of his responsibilities will lie in this field. In religious education he will not join the propagandists and indoctrinators. He will recognize that religious education is *education,* and will commit the process to educators, who, in turn, will lift the whole program out of the range of prejudice and controversy, and will provide for the young character training which every open-minded parent desires for his children.

He will provide for the free and intelligent discussions by the citizens of both community problems and the large public questions of the day. He will himself take no partisan attitude toward any of them. His function will be to see that the common intelligence shall get unfettered expression, and he will be loyal to the common decisions.

Above all, he will clear the way for action. He will not allow religion to evaporate in unctuous sentimentalism nor in futile wrangling over intellectual differences. Nor will he prescribe a system of ethics and personal motivations to which each citizen must conform as a basis of religious activity. He will not conduct evangelistic services and seek to "convert" the citizens to emotional or mystical responses. He will allow motivations to spring from what source they may in the personal experience of each citizen; he will drive for actions, for the fulfilment of common purposes. He will get things done. He will build the good society, not in impossible theories or doctrines, not in vague hopes of an other-world society, but in the institutions and social programs of his community.

Can such leaders be found? In plenty, with a little intelligent search. Will communities invite and support such leaders? Ah, there's the rub! We must find them, one of them, a few of them to start with. After the early laboratory demonstrations have been made, progress will be irresistible and accelerated. Where will enough citizens in a given community take hold of their affairs and move out courageously?

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Jottings

When the militarists say that man is a fighting animal, they may be right. Two men in New York recently shot one another to death in a dispute over a checker game!

The utter unimportance of the recent French elections is shown by the fact that Herriot's Radical Socialists are neither radical nor socialist. France, for all its changes of parties and premiers, remains always the same.

What's in a name? "Al" Capone's first name is Alphonse. Felix Adler is a clown in the Ringling Brothers circus. The mayor of Boston, one of the most sinuous sidesteppers of his time, is called Curley. What's in a name, indeed?

Mooney, innocent, is still in prison after fifteen years. Massie, guilty by his own confession, was released from prison after a single hour. This is the American idea of justice.

Japan has recalled her army from Shanghai. Just the way a man recalls his hands from a bear's tail!

"Labor to keep alive in your breast that little spark of celestial fire called conscience."—*George Washington.*

Ha! Ha! Ha! Ho! Ho! Ho! Hee! Hee! Hee! —CONSCIENCE? What a joke!—*H. L. Mencken et al.*

J. H. H.

In Defense of Freedom*

I

The battle for freedom is never over, the fight is never won. Each generation must struggle anew for the liberty which its forefathers sought through desperate sacrifice, even bloodshed. America is no exception. A half-hundred professional patriotic societies have grown up to demand in the name of patriotism the suppression of almost any proposal which threatens even remotely the "vested interests." We have one "patriotic" cult which insists that those who will not pledge unquestioningly to fight in any war, right or wrong, shall be denied citizenship. Another cult insists that any alien who believes in the very theory of revolutionary violence—on which this nation was founded—shall be deported. Still others content themselves with drawing up blacklists of prominent citizens who differ at certain points from the herd. Any significant deviation from the mores of the dominant majority—that is to say, from capitalism, one-hundred-percent-ism, or the profit motive—is quite likely to set off the hounds of some persecutory pack in full swing after the innovator.

The most unfortunate aspect of all this is that we have lost our liberties, if not painlessly, at least unconsciously. Of course, we all believe in theoretical freedom of speech, only we draw the line at "license" and the latter is defined to include any of our fears or taboos.

The War saw the enactment of repressive legislation. Men were imprisoned for mere faith in peaceful action, the Department of Justice was turned into a huge instrument of repression, and even the Supreme Court was unable to stem the tide. Today criminal syndicalist laws are in force which punish membership in any trade union advocating "the unlawful destruction of property." Thus the archaic theory of punishment for mere association is now the law of the land. The right of workers to organize, to strike, and to picket have been seriously jeopardized by legalizing yellow dog contracts, under which workers cannot join a union, and by prohibitive injunctions. Twenty-eight States have passed anti-red flag laws. The United States Department of Justice has listed 100,000 radicals, including some of the most distinguished citizens of the republic. The result of all this is that certain minorities no longer have the free right to speak their honest convictions.

Thirteen years after the end of the War which was supposed to end all war, we find a Congressional Fish Committee engaging in a nation-wide hunt for "reds" and actually recommending the enactment of legislation designed to reintroduce in the Secret Service Department the worst tyrannies of the notorious era of Attorney General Daugherty. The Committee would also outlaw the Communist Party from the ballot box and thus prove beyond contradiction the thesis of the Bolsheviks that Communism could never be introduced through peaceful political means—that violence is the only way out.

One reason for this almost unbelievable state of affairs which has crept so silently upon us is that America has neglected to teach the real meaning of liberty. To the average American the Declaration of Independence is the name of a noble historic document, always to be revered even if not practised, and whose precise meaning for our own age is lost in the mists of antiquity. As Mark Twain long ago declared: "The American people enjoy three great blessings — free speech, free press, and the good sense not to use either." By this he merely meant that paper rights are non-existent except as we know enough to use them.

Our schools do not teach the fundamentals of freedom. The child mind is not taught to believe in liberty for those whose opinions are diametrically at variance with our own. They are not told that every one of our most cherished rights was first championed by a minority—that free agitation is necessary to progress. Instead, if a student joins the Communist Party her high school diploma is withheld. Several such cases from California were proudly proclaimed by professed "patriots" to the Fish Committee as examples of the "highest" educational policy. If a girl in the grammar grades refuses to salute the American flag because her parents have taught her to be loyal to the working class of every country, she is severely

*An article in two parts. The second part will be published next week.—Editor.

punished or debarred from school, instead of having demonstrated to her by our understanding and tolerance the basic principle of liberty for which the flag stands.

It is high time for all of us to ponder over the precise reasons why liberty and freedom were built into the foundations of our republic. It will be remembered that on July 4, 1776, the Congress of the thirteen United States of America unanimously declared:

> We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any freedom of government becomes destructive of these ends it is the right of the people to alter it or to abolish it and to institute a new government.

Governments, then, are means, not ends. If government fails to fulfil the end of liberty and happiness for the people, it should be overthrown. Every sincere individual who believes that the government is hopelessly in the hands of injustice must urge its overthrow, if he is to be true to the Declaration of Independence.

In other words, our forefathers recognized that freedom of speech is, in the last analysis, the liberty on which all other liberties rest. Without it all freedom is in jeopardy. It is easy to say that freedom of speech may incite to riot. The answer is, not to deny freedom of speech, but through processes of education and open discussion to make men riot-proof.

The former Mr. Justice Wilson of the United States Supreme Court once declared that the right of revolution "should be taught as a principle of the Constitution of the United States in every state in the Union." Indeed, in the early days of this republic popular zeal threatened those who opposed revolutionary ideas. As late as 1805 an American citizen by the name of Joseph Dennie was arrested for that very reason. Thomas Jefferson, in his first inaugural address as President, declared:

> If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or change its republican form, let them stand as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it.

Jefferson drew limits to freedom, but it was at the point of an *overt* act, as he said:

> We have nothing to fear from the demoralized reasonings of some, if others are left free to demonstrate their errors and especially when the law stands ready to punish the first criminal act produced by the false reasonings; these are safer corrections than the conscience of a judge.*

Our American tradition of freedom has always held that mere utterance should never be made a crime, except in the case of criminal libel. Words and deeds, or attempted deeds, should never be confused. In the day when America has already largely forgotten her own revolutionary origins, it may sound shocking to say that men should be given the right to support a doctrine of future revolution. We should remember the famous phrase of Voltaire: "I detest what you say, but I will fight with my life for your right to say it."

This is not a defense of freedom for a definite incitement to a specific act of murder, but rather the right of any one to support a doctrine of revolution. Until the World War, the federal law never made utterances a crime. Even then the Supreme Court laid down the rule that there must be a "clear and present danger" to the State of an overt act following the utterance. Just where today is America threatened by a *clear* and *present* danger? A score or more of professional patriotic societies and the Congressional Fish Committee would retort, "Beware of the Communist menace and revolution!" But it is preposterous to claim that there is any real and present danger from the Communists. Their numbers are so pitifully small that if they were given freedom to agitate without restraint from the Atlantic to the Pacific there would be no more danger of America adopting Communism than a Japanese Emperor or a German Kaiser.

Neither can it be said that the Communists have incited to specific acts or violence. The American Civil Liberties Union states that in all its experience it does not know of a single such case. Moreover, advocacy of violence by reactionaries against radicals, strikers, and Negroes are common. The law does not prosecute them. In Oklahoma alone an official investigation showed two thousand cases of mob violence on the part of the Klan, yet not a person inciting these acts has ever been punished. It would, then, be grossly unfair for the law to suppress Communism because it stands for a doctrine advocating violence in a remote future: this would mean one law for the reactionaries and another for the radicals. No; as Justice Holmes of the United States Supreme Court has said:

> If in the long run the beliefs expressed in proletarian dictatorships are destined to be accepted by the dominant forces of the community, the only meaning of free speech is that they should be given their chance and have their way.

According to our American traditions, Communists should have the same right to urge a change in government as any other group. If they think that injustice is so entrenched that it is impossible to change government by democratic means, then they have a right to say that violence must in time come. To deny them this right is but to deny them what our forefathers fought and died to secure.

Wendell Phillips once declared:

> No matter whose lips would speak, they must be free and ungagged. The community which dares not protect its most hated member in the free utterance of his opinions, no matter how false or hateful, is only a gang of slaves. If there is anything in the universe that can't stand discussion, let it crack!

Thomas Jefferson repeatedly reiterated this sentiment:

> I hold a little rebellion now and then is a good thing and is necessary in the political world as storms in the physical. . . . What signify a few lives lost in a century or two? The tree of liberty must be refreshed from time to time with the blood of patriots and tyrants.

John Adams, another President of the United States, in the days before the doctrine of liberty was denatured by the soft comforts of prosperity, said:

> The rights of a nation to kill a tyrant in case of necessity can no more be doubted than to hang a robber or kill a flea.

Abraham Lincoln in his first inaugural said:

> This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they grow weary of the existing Government they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it or the revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it.

President Woodrow Wilson said:

> We have forgotten the very principles of our origin, if we have forgotten how to object, how to resist, how to agitate, how to pull down and build up, even to the extent of revolutionary practices if it be necessary.

If the Fish Committee and other reactionaries had

*This principle was embodied in the law of Virginia in 1786 and was later approved by the Supreme Court of the United States.

their way, Wendell Phillips, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, Abraham Lincoln, and Woodrow Wilson, had they been of foreign birth, would all have been deported for expressing these great historic sentiments.

So basic is our tradition of freedom of speech that twenty-four States have written into their Constitutions provisions forbidding the passage of laws curtailing or abridging it. The provision of Indiana is typical: "No law shall be passed restraining the free interchange of thought and opinion." Not only is freedom guaranteed but a total of thirty-nine out of forty-eight State Constitutions provide that the people shall always have the right to change their government. The Constitution of New Hampshire, for instance, says:

> The Government being instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security of the whole community and not for the private interest or emolument of any one man, family, or class of men; therefore whenever the ends of government are perverted, and public liberty manifestly endangered, and all other means of redress are ineffectual, the people may and of a right ought to reform the old or establish a new government. The doctrine of non-resistance against arbitrary power, and oppression, is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind.

Throughout all American history, the basic genius of our institutions has been, above all else, the support of freedom. If the time should ever come when the press is muzzled, when speech is not independent and untrammeled, and when minds are shackled by fear, it would mean the end of our American form of government. Republics are no better than dictatorships except as they guarantee to every citizen that liberty of thought and action which has been traditional in our American history.

JEROME DAVIS.
Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

(To be concluded)

The Time for Total Disarmament Now

[From Our Special Correspondent]

I am of English ancestry as far back as the Battle of Hastings. I have spent several months observing the activities of the Council, the Conference, the Assembly at Geneva. I then went back to New York expecting to remain. I felt a call to come back to Geneva, which I could not resist. My story is of no importance, except as it throws light on the drama for world peace being enacted at Geneva, which is sure to affect the destiny of humanity. Everyone ought to be *deeply concerned* in this drama.

1. *Why did I come back to Geneva?*

It started on the ocean. My childhood memory of the Jonah parable may have suggested that I was running away from "Nineveh." Jonah had been ordered to preach repentance to Nineveh, lest it be destroyed. The conviction grew upon me that war would destroy civilization, if the nations did not repent, and completely disarm at once. I could see no hope elsewhere—and here was I running westward away from Geneva, while the nations were engaged in sweet words or futile measures; were doing everything except to disarm. And it was a *disarmament* conference.

I spent ten days in New York, in conversation and correspondence. The people were just getting past excitement over the invasion of China by Japan. They were generally skeptical and cynical about obtaining real results at Geneva, through the Conference. They frankly declared that lopping off a few arms here and there would not bring relief, nor quiet fear. When in committees, clubs, meetings, I referred to total disarmament at once—there was immediately a look of hope, and not infrequently a declaration that it was the only way to peace. I discovered that eight or ten U. S. Senators would favor having the U. S. thoroughly discuss total disarmament at Geneva—that a couple of them favored U. S. disarming alone, as an example. I found more faith in total disarmament than in reduction!

All this time three ideas were moving in my mind: total disarmament at once will bring equality and security and relieve the financial depression—and it is the only thing that will. Reduction and compromise will lead to no one knows where. Second, in this year, 1932, the English-speaking nations possess the dominant power of control. With them therefore lies the responsibility for leading to restore world confidence and commerce. Third, I believe in man's capacity to get free from the clutches of war—and, so I am everywhere urging *total disarmament now,* as the sane and simple way to peace.

I am returning to Geneva to watch for all signs of drift towards total disarmament, to use all power I may possess over friends here and elsewhere to bring it to pass. I quickly grant that to the multitude it seems not feasible. Never mind. Doubt not. The future belongs to it! . . . And who knows—a *divine deadlock* may come to pass over disarmament, when God will reveal to the nations that the only way to peace is by the abolition of arms—totally, not some time, "in the sky," but here and *now!* Here's hoping!

2. *On the way back to Geneva.*

Wonderful trip from New York to Geneva—arriving in Geneva six days from start! A palace hotel of a ship rushing through the waves at twenty-seven miles an hour. The ship so big that one could hardly hear the fog horn. A fellow-passenger sent a message of greeting to his daughter as she was about to be married in Manila, 13,000 miles away. Her name was Ruth—so the message was from the book of Ruth. "Where thou goest, I will go; thy people shall be my people." And our queen of the seas was "made in Germany." And, the Germans, recently the nations were out to destroy them by every device born to ingenuity. Man was not made to kill, but to create, to build, to cooperate. Everything seems to proclaim: disarm, and at once!

And so through beautiful France—from Cherbourg to Paris and on to Switzerland, where four peoples live unitedly under one government. I walked around wonderful Paris, passed the Hotel de Crillon and thought of President Wilson, with his sad efforts for peace, a victim of diplomacy and compromise. Would that he (and others) could have been uncompromising for general disarmament, as they sat round the Peace (?) Table. There would have been no Slough of Despond, as resulted. What a stroll it is from the Arc de Triomphe to Place de la Bastille! Half the

signs are of War. Avenues, Esplanade des Invalides, and the like. Wonderful Paris—for beauty, charm and social intelligence. A Paradise? Yes, but like Paradise, with a serpent crawling in its streets and entering its homes—the Serpent of War. Unless cast out, the Serpent will destroy this Paradise. As I took the train from the Gare de Lyon for Geneva, I could almost hear a refrain in the street cries—there is but one way of escape (for Paris seeking security, and for all other nations), it is the way of total disarmament. This is the time for Total Disarmament *now*. So, all through the night and into the wee hours of morn, the wheels of the train seemed to click—This is the time for Total Disarmament *now*—on until the station at Geneva—Total Disarmament is the only way out!

I give France and Britain a hundred years to be cast out of their Paradise, unless they repent, like Nineveh, and break the sword! They will otherwise become like Carthage, a mother bereft of her children. They are seeking security and international control. Total disarmament will best bring it.

3. *And this is Geneva.* What do I plan and urge others to do?

a. Stand uncompromisingly for *total disarmament* now. The evil of war has become so vast and immediate a menace to mankind, that compromise is now a sin. The house is on fire. The time to discuss insurance, preparation, good and bad fires is past. The fire should be put out, and all inflammable materials be removed.

It looked, on the day of my arrival in Geneva, as if the door had been slammed in the face of total disarmament, when the Conference voted to proceed to take the first decisive step (ten weeks after it had convened!) of "general reduction to the lowest possible level." One must not be cynical, and yet he must not overlook the fact that that promise, in exactly the same words, was put in a Treaty in 1919! This Conference has not got further than agreeing on this, in principle.

What I am trying to make clear, now and hereafter, is that total disarmament now—to be begun at once—exactly fills the requirement for "general disarmament to the lowest level."

b. There is only one other low level—not so good—that contains elements of equality, justice, security, along with practicability—it is to make the disarmed condition of Germany the standard—universally applied—for disarmament. Germany's disarmament was done in ninety days. The same operation could be performed on all in the same time. If this is a Conference for disarmament instead of a Conference for not to disarm, then the proposition to disarm to Germany's level should be most seriously considered by the Conference, and not side-tracked by Benes or Simon remarking, "It is not in the framework of the Draft Convention."

If I were a German representative to the Conference I should not sign any treaty that did not recognize Germany's right to equality. Every hope of world peace cries out against inequality.

c. About the worst thing that can be done is to attempt to reduce armaments, either qualitatively or quantitatively, especially if some of the Powers are holding on to canals, colonies, supply-bases, in various parts of the world.

I am unable to think of any physical disarmament—unless it be after the German situation as a standard—that would have the promise of bringing real peace to the nations. For the last two days I have listed in the Glass House of the League, while the leading statesmen of the world were discussing—Grandi, Boncour, Simon, Benes, Madariaga—the principle of qualitative disarmament, and by way of illustration reference was made to bacteria and noxious gases, but no one was ready to name these for the chopping-block. When it comes to picking out a principle or a practice in the field of disarmament, because each nation begins to interpret it in the light of "national safety" or of "enforcement by common action" or take account of its "geographical situation and circumstances"—the differences are a multitude and almost incapable of being ironed out. The result is endless confusion.

There are thus three possible things to be done at Geneva. Total Disarmament *now*—the simplest, sanest, best method of all. The people of the world would rejoice in this. . . . The next best method is for all to disarm to the level of Germany. This would be just, but not so easy, not so satisfactory as total disarmament now. . . . The third method is reduction gained by compromise, diplomacy, bargaining, resting on the shifting passions of men—a reduction that is only seeming disarmament, a reduction made by war minds, with no repentance, nor restoration, nor forgiveness in it—a condition that cannot possibly remove the fears of men nor give them faith. It does not spell a world at peace. Why not recognize this? . . . Reduction and limitation of armaments—in method or principle—are utterly futile in stopping war.

This is what I am looking for at Geneva. I am looking for a deadlock. In fact, I am praying for it—for if it comes, it will mean that men see that they cannot find a basis for peace on war-mentality and war conditions. That will be a good thing to discover, that war cannot be ended by war, that hell cannot be cured by more hell. In a great moment of sanity, the nations once declared that war should be outlawed. Another great moment of sanity is due—why not now at Geneva?—when the nations shall declare that armaments are outlawed.

That means Total Disarmament *now*. The sanest, swiftest, simplest, most satisfactory, in fact the only method worth considering.

To the English-speaking nations in the Conference—to you is given the dominant power of control. To you I appeal—to my own. With you is the responsibility. God calls upon you to abolish arms, and end war. . . . It might begin on a small scale, if Gibson should advance to Litvinoff and say, "Shake, Citizen (an Americanism of the days of '76) I'm with you on total disarmament"—the very Glass-house would shake with joy, and the delegates would cheer. Why not?

This town of Geneva has known great men and been the birthplace of great ideas. I recall Calvin, who lifted up the revolutionary idea of democracy; Knox, unafraid of kings or queens; Servetus, intrepid martyr; Rousseau, pioneer in education. Why not another revolution around the great idea of the absolute repudiation of force and the abolition of savage weapons. It would mean a new politics, a new mentality, a new peace. God wills it.

Geneva, Switzerland. SYDNEY STRONG.

Patriotism at 5%

[From Our Special Correspondent]

On April 5th a report appeared on the financial page of the *Morning Post* (and most of our daily papers) of the 65th Annual Meeting of Vickers Ltd. The Chairman (General, the Hon. Sir Herbert A. Lawrence, G. C. B.) pointed out that "the general world-trade depression and the reduction in armaments under the influence of public opinion both in this and in other countries have affected adversely your company's trading results. The net profit is £574,493, a reduction of £201,433 compared with 1930, and allows the payment of a dividend of 5 per cent on the Ordinary Share Capital. . . . "

The Chairman mentioned certain new inventions in armaments which (he said) would have proved "very remunerative" had the demand for armaments been "normal."

Patriotic references were made to the Boer War (when both sides fought with arms supplied by Vickers—a fact not mentioned in this address) and to the Great War, but the Chairman deprecated "a policy of economic nationalism, which in aiming at domestic independence is destroying world progress and world prosperity."

Finally he declared that "without some general revival of trade, and particularly more orders for armaments and shipbuilding, the immediate outlook is not encouraging. . . . " Efforts, however, were being made to facilitate purchases by prospective customers —"particularly from overseas"—and the financial position of the Company was still secure in anticipation of the time "when a period of trade prosperity returns."

You who for profit make and sell
The unassembled parts of Hell,
Whose patriotic voice resents
Reduction in our armaments,
How shall a nation make amends
When patriots lose their dividends?

Rather than you should be content
With an ungenerous five per cent,
The Navy League shall shout for more
And bigger, brighter, ships of war,
Or fiery colonels shall assail
The columns of the *Daily Mail*
And Beaver's organs* shall *Express*
The indignation of the press.

Then, when the national demand
Of Britain first (at Heaven's command)
And other nations, following suit
Shall bring the war that is its fruit,
The hand that sowed the dragon's teeth
Shall crown our crosses with a wreath.

And so, with patriotic aid,
You shall regain your *normal* trade
And patriotism shall present
Increase at ten or twelve per cent:
Then future chairmen shall applaud
A record output, shipped abroad,
Till all the world in wonder sees
How patriots love their enemies.

In all of this, I must confess,
I fear you will have much success,
And you will fatten out of war
As you have often done before:
But spare us, as your sales increase
This cant of progress and of peace.

REGINALD A. REYNOLDS.

London, England.

*Lord Beaverbrook's papers, of which two of the principal ones are the *Daily Express* and the *Sunday Express*.

A Contrast

In 1815 England sent Napoleon into exile on a lonely island; in 1931 the same imperial power sent Mahatma Gandhi to Baroda Jail. The fundamental reason was the same in both cases. Both victims endangered the established order of things. But here the parallel ends. Napoleon had been, at the height of his power, the richest man in the world. Gandhi has been, from the beginning of his influence, a beggar. Napoleon won his following by appeals to venality. He promoted his generals to marshals and paid them as high as a million francs a year. He bought dynasties by princely payments. Gandhi has won his following by spiritual appeal. His only promise has been the assurance of opportunity to serve through sacrifice.

Napoleon went to his exile on a warship, accompanied by the skeleton trappings of his imperial power. Gandhi went to jail in a police car, dressed in a loin cloth, his only baggage, a tooth brush and a spinning wheel. Napoleon spent the last six years of his life in a cow-shed improvised into a palace, brooding over his past glories. Gandhi, with no attendants, sits on the floor of Baroda Jail spinning, reflecting, and praying for the future. Napoleon died in exile, a bitter man. If Gandhi dies in Baroda Jail, the end will be one of spiritual resignation.

Napoleon's vast empire, with its world wide power, had disintegrated before his death. Of all the dynasties established by the sword during his reign as First Consul and Emperor, only one, Sweden, on whose throne he placed a marshal, who afterward betrayed him, has endured. Gandhi's power of love grows day by day. The influence that he wields is neither propagated by gold nor limited by dynastic boundaries. Its medium is the human spirit. It transcends prison walls as readily as provincial boundaries. It has no material limitations and no worldly power can stop it. Were Gandhi to die today his kingdom of love would grow into an empire of spiritual power.

FRANK E. BAKER.

Sun Up!

[*Translated from the Italian of Cardúcci*]

Out toward the western sky the white clouds float ethereal,
Adown the streets the limpid heavens laugh!
As through the market place, benign, imperial,
The sun gives salutation unto human toil.

The cathedral lifts a thousand glistening spires
In the radiant dawn; her golden saints hosannas sing;
While round about the dusky flight of rooks
Makes the air quiver with cries like wingéd choirs.

Thus, too, has love with her sweet smile
Swept far away the clouds that weighed me down;
My soul is lifted high unto the sun
And smiles to him in myriad ways;
Life, sanctified, bestows her holy crown,
Making a harmony of every thought,—
While every nerve bursts into song!

LILLIAN BROWNE-OLF.

The Study Table

Ireland Sheds Light on India

Friends of India, and friends of humanity, were concerned when they read that the campaign against the Nationalists of India had been put in charge of Sir John Anderson, former leader of the "Black and Tans," who committed such cruelties in Ireland. The present situation in India has called out a remarkable book* from another man who was in Ireland at that time, but a man of very different stamp—Brigadier General F. P. Crozier, C. B., C. M. G., D. S. O. He writes with surprising frankness. He confesses, "Had I known what I was in for in 1920, when I consented to go to Ireland to take part in suppressing the Sinn Fein revolution, I should never have touched it." He says:

> There has been much burning and arson in India of late. The burning of Cork in 1920 by British troops affords an excellent example of what should be avoided in India. Young British officers, drunk and arrogant and flushed with blood, first pumped petrol on the roof of the City Hall and then fired "Verey" lights onto the inflammable matter. Crown forces cut the hose of the fire engines. Cheer after cheer went up from the khaki clowns as the flames leaped high and the fire-fighting appliances proved ineffective. . . . In Ireland, we organized secret assassinations by the police so late as 1921. There is no knowing to what depths governments will not stoop to "keep going."

A young English missionary named Reynolds lately made his way to Delhi from the North West Province to protest to the Viceroy against the barbarities committed by the troops, such, he said, as almost made one ashamed to be an Englishman. According to him, their method was to raid the villages in the dead of night, beat up all the villagers, strip them of their clothing and burn it, and burn down the Nationalist headquarters. Gen. Crozier says:

> When it is remembered that all the atrocities in Ireland, committed by servants of the crown, and all the murders, burglaries, thefts, illegal imprisonments, cruelties, beatings, burnings and perjuries carried out in the name of law and order, happened within less than twelve hours' journey of the Houses of Parliament, one can but hope that in these difficult days, India and Palestine, far removed from the heart of the Empire and made up of peoples of different races, may be more fortunate.

The English public was kept informed about the anti-British violence committed in Ireland, of which there was plenty, but the news on the other side was suppressed. Gen. Crozier says:

> When it is considered that for over sixteen months, representatives of the people of the greatest Empire in the world were lied to, deceived, hoodwinked, fooled and "let down" by the people whose duty it was to tell the truth and "play the game," in order that a rotten régime might be kept alive, one cannot help hoping that in India and at Westminster the people's representatives may this time be more lucky in their methods of approach towards the truth.

Americans interested in India have long been chafing under the close British censorship maintained over the news from that country. The rulers of India, like the rulers of the Kentucky coal fields, do not want the outside world to know what is going on there. In both cases, the natural inference is that they have reason to dread the light. General Crozier says further:

> From what I know of many Anglo-Indians—my grandfather and father served the crown in the land of the rupee for many years—their sloppy mentality, their lack of vision, their misunderstanding of the words "loyalty" and "patriotism," their arrogance and uselessness if unattended by henchmen, their lack of general knowledge and education, their constant quest for pensions and perferment, their lack of ability to discern the difference between right and wrong, if crossed by expediency, and their idea that India was originally made by God in order that Englishmen should find work and good pay there at the expense of the Indians, I believe the official class in India would find little difficulty in subscribing to a similar policy to that put in practice in Ireland.

Of course, there are in India administrators of a nobler character; but it is to be feared that these are not the majority. Human nature does not show, in any country, a majority of men who can possess irresponsible power without abusing it. Gen. Crozier adds these remarkable words:

> Having seen a great deal of force in use, having applied that force for over thirty years, having experienced the utter failure of force, I must needs look for other weapons with which to achieve the object—the welfare of mankind.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

*"A Word to Gandhi: The Lesson of Ireland," by Brigadier-General F. P. Crozier, C. B., C. M. G., D. S. O. Williams and Norgate, Ltd., London. 4s 6d.

The Myth of German War-Guilt

In 1930 there was published a large two-volume history of the origins of the Great War entitled "The Coming of the War, 1914," by Professor Bernadotte E. Schmidt, of the University of Chicago. This was an elaborate piece of work intended by the author and announced by the publisher to be a final statement on the moot question of responsibility for the world's greatest and most disastrous conflict of arms. By many critics it was accepted as a corrective even of Professor Fay's "The Origins of the World War." Such judgment on the authoritative character of this book as a work of historical scholarship seemed to be confirmed and established by the Pulitzer Prize Committee which in the spring of 1931 conferred upon Professor Schmidt its award for the best history published during the preceding year.

"The Coming of the War, 1914" was to many persons a disturbing book. It was a frank and detailed restatement of the doctrine of German guilt, and seemed therefore to destroy the conclusions of the revisionist school of modern historians who had reached the verdict that the war guilt was a distributed guilt. Professor Harry Elmer Barnes was the man who started the revisionist bombardment which had apparently smashed into fragments Article 231 of the Treaty of Versailles. His salvo, backed up by the heavy artillery, of which Professor Fay's book was the biggest gun of all, had seemed to establish the truth that Austria and Russia, France and even England must share with Germany the charge of having wrecked our modern civilization. But here was a work of inclusive scope and detailed analysis which went far toward restoring the propaganda argument against the Kaiser's government. It was all the more impressive in that Professor Schmidt seemed to be absolutely honest, a conscientious and open-minded historian, who was following the lead of facts not known to or rightly interpreted by his predecessors.

But now the tables are turned again! In the University of Missouri there is a professor, Dr. M. H. Cochran, who is one of the outstanding authorities on the question of the origins of the Great War. His articles in *Current History* and his essays in certain scholarly reviews have established his reputation beyond all question. Stirred by Professor Schmidt's work to a re-

examination of the whole problem, Professor Cochran has now published a book entitled "Germany Not Guilty in 1914,"* which is a study, sentence by sentence, almost word by word, of Schmidt's "much prized book." His results are devastating. He shows by chapter and verse that Professor Schmidt is misinformed, has misread his documents, has been betrayed into false conclusions from established data, has mixed up his dates and persons, has mistranslated crucial passages in official documents and letters. There can be no question in any mind, after Cochran's book has been read, that Schmidt has again and again used inferior sources and misused good sources. What is worse than this, Cochran presents impressive circumstantial evidence that Professor Schmidt has not been any too honest in his handling of material, but has warped and twisted the meaning of essential facts, misplaced or altogether suppressed small details of vast importance, and offered misinterpretations always working to the disadvantage of Germany and advantage of the Allies. Even Professor Schmidt's style betrays him—his adjectives and phrases of characterization always suggest the innocence of Russia and France and the stupidity, or aggressiveness, or patent guilt of the Central Empires. Professor Cochran's *critique* proves much, but nothing so conclusively as the fact that when Professor Schmidt sat down to write his book he started out not to find the truth, but to prove a thesis already fixed in his mind years before and, to his growing dismay, now hopelessly damaged by the discoveries of the revisionist historians of the Barnes and Fay school. Professor Schmidt, in other words, is not a historian at all but an advocate. His book is interesting; as a plea for the prosecution against Germany, it is important. But Cochran has proved for good and all that it has no standing in the field of scholarship, and cannot be used as an authoritative historical source.

Professor Cochran's work is all the more significant in view of the fact that he has himself never been numbered among the revisionists. Professor Barnes points this out in an important "Foreword" to his volume. These revisionists, says Barnes, "might be suspected by the bitter-enders of desiring to support their own position. . . . No such charge can be launched against Professor Cochran . . . as a middle-of-the-road man he has been a frequent, if honest, critic of the decisive revisionism represented by writers like myself and those who share my views. He has not been motivated by partisanship but by honest indignation at flagrant abuses of the elementary principles of historical method and the fulsome praise of such behavior by supposedly eminent specialists in the profession."

Professor Barnes points out that this book "marks an innovation in American historical writing. It is the first time that the spirit of thorough and searching criticism of a living historian, so gratifyingly common in Continental European scholarship, has been illustrated on a full-sized scale in the United States." This is the kind of innovation that we believe in. Professor Cochran has done a priceless service to the cause of truth. His book is not the sort of work to be crowned by a Pulitzer Prize in America, but it should have the attention of every person who desires to be well-informed on the question of war origins. Especially should those who have been misled by Professor Schmidt do penance and find correction by reading Cochran's every word.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

*"Germany Not Guilty in 1914," by M. H. Cochran. Published by the Stratford Company, Boston, Massachusetts.

Extra-territoriality in Japan

The diplomatic history of modern Japan is of very great interest to all those who wish to get a thorough understanding of World Politics today. During the nineteenth century Japan, like all other oriental states, didn't enjoy full sovereignty and was a victim of western domination. After the opening of Japan by Commodore Perry in 1853-54, the western powers encroached upon Japanese sovereignty through the imposition of extra-territorial jurisdiction. During the period of 1853-1899, Japanese statesmen in succession tried their best to remove the limitations on Japanese sovereignty through negotiations and by bringing about necessary changes in internal condition of the country, especially by introducing various forms of judicial reforms. Japan's efforts to remove "extra-territorial jurisdiction" forms the most important part of the diplomatic history of the country during 1853-1899. Mr. Jones, in this work on "Extra-territoriality,"* has very admirably covered the subject of the diplomatic history of Japan in relation to the abolition of extra-territoriality.

The first Europeans to reach Japan were the Portuguese in 1542. The Spaniards came during the latter part of the sixteenth century, whereas the Dutch and the English appeared on the scene during the early seventeenth century. In 1638, the Japanese government, suspicious of westerners who were fomenters of rebellion, issued an edict declaring "total exclusion of foreigners" from Japan. During the period of 1542 to 1638, there was a form of extra-territoriality in Japan. The legal status of foreigners, during this period is explained in a letter of patent of October 8, 1613, issued by Ieyasu to Captain John Saris, representative of the English East India Company. By its fourth clause, the English in Japan were to be amenable only to the head of their factory for all offenses they might commit in Japan, while the same official was to have cognizance of all questions affecting the property of his countrymen. The Spanish and Dutch were accorded similar privileges. (p. 6.) The above-mentioned concession was a favor granted by Japan to the foreigners and this was not extracted from Japan by force or by any treaty right.

In 1854 the United States signed the Treaty of Kanagawa by which several Japanese ports were opened to U. S. ships and the United States secured rights to trade with Japan. The treaty included, however, a most favored-nation clause which secured to the United States any future privileges granted to other nations. (p. 12.) Following the example of the United States, Great Britian and other nations concluded similar treaties. The nature of limitation of sovereignty of Japan, imposed by these treaties can be well understood from the following: (1) All questions in regard to rights, whether of property or of person, arising between citizens of a treaty-power residing in Japan, shall be subject to the jurisdiction of the authorities of the said treaty-power. In like manner the Japanese shall not interfere in any question which may arise between the citizens of a treaty-power and the subjects

*Extra-territoriality in Japan and the Diplomatic Relations Resulting in Its Abolition, 1853-1899. By F. C. Jones, M. A., published by Yale University Press, New Haven. (U. S. A.) 1931. Pages 331. Price $3.00.

of any other treaty power. (2) Citizens of a treaty power, who may commit any crime against Japanese subjects or the subjects of any other nation, shall be brought before the authorities of the country of the offender and punished according to the laws of their country. (p. 27.)

By the Tariff Convention of June 25, 1866, concluded between Japan and United States, Great Britain, France and Holland, Japanese Government was prohibited from demanding more than 5 per cent tariff on the majority of foreign articles. This certainly limited Japanese economic independence.

Until 1871 the Japanese Government didn't take any decisive step toward the abolition of "extra-territoriality." In December, 1871, a Japanese diplomatic mission under the leadership of Prince Iwakura left Japan for the United States, and to visit Great Britian and other countries of Europe, with the purpose of inducing the important treaty powers to revise treaties and to abolish extra-territoriality. The mission was unsuccessful and returned to Japan in 1873. The main argument of the powers was that they could not consent to removal of "extra-territoriality" unless Japanese laws were modified to conform with the practices of the civilized nations. The Japanese government at once in 1873 appointed a committee to revise the penal code, following the Code Napoleon, under the direction of a French expert, M. Boissonade. Steps were taken to reform the Civil Code in 1875 and in 1876-1877 steps were taken to reform Japanese police and prisons. After adopting these measures Japan called for a conference of powers in Tokyo and demanded a revision of the existing treaties. In July, 1878, U. S. Minister to Japan (Mr. Bingham) and U. S. Secretary of State Mr. Everts agreed to Japan's rights to tariff reform and a new treaty, which really became ineffective because other Treaty Powers refused to consider it. Great Britian was the bitter opponent of any proposition involving treaty-revision.

After the completion of the work of various committees on Judicial Reform in 1880, Count Inouye as Foreign Minister of Japan asked the treaty powers for treaty revision guaranteeing Japan full judicial autonomy. Japan made a special representation to Great Britain which has considerable interest in Japan. However, in the conference on judicial autonomy held in Tokyo in 1882 Japan presented a modified proposition that she might attain judicial autonomy and tariff autonomy within five years. Although the United States and Germany supported Japanese claims, the convention was a total failure due to British opposition to the Japanese proposition. Possibly the reason for British opposition was that the British government was afraid that the concession of judicial autonomy to Japan would have unpleasant repercussions in the British position in China and India (p. 101). In spite of the failure of the conference, the Japanese statesmen in successive governments — particularly Count Inouye, Viscount Aoki, Count Okuma—worked unceasingly to recover Japanese sovereignty. Obstinacy on the part of the treaty powers gave rise to anti-foreign agitation in Japan. Marquis Okuma was a victim of a bomb outrage in 1889, because the populace were infuriated with the suggestion that Count Okuma would agree to the establishment of Mixed Courts in which the foreign judges would be in majority, to try cases involving foreign interests. In 1891 an attempt was made to assassinate the Tsarovich who was visiting Japan.

After trying various means, the Japanese statesmen decided that before making any attempt for a general revision of the existing treaties with powers, Japan should secure British support. After considerable efforts on the part of Japanese statesmen the Aoki-Kimberly Treaty of June 16, 1894, was signed by Great Britain and Japan, "and extra-territoriality" was abolished. However, because of the existence of "favored nation clause" in the existing treaties between Japan and treaty powers, the Aoki-Kimberly Treaty did not come into operation until France, the last of the treaty powers, signed a treaty in 1899 abolishing "extra-territoriality." It may be mentioned that Japanese victory in the Sino-Japanese War (1894-95) helped Japan to assert her full sovereignty.

Mr. Jones, in his work, "Extra-territorality in Japan," gives an excellent description of all pertinent facts relating to this phase of the diplomatic history of Japan. It makes clear many obscure points and presents a well-documented, scholarly and authentic study on the subject. It shows clearly the continuity of Japanese foreign policy and workings of Japanese statesmen belonging to various political parties to achieve the same end of assertion of Japan as an unfettered sovereign Power. Mr. Jones' book is a very valuable contribution to the history of Japanese diplomacy and world politics.

TARAKNATH DAS.

New York City.

Correspondence

Bankers and Veterans

Editor of UNITY:

I have been a subscriber to UNITY for a number of years, and have been interested and benefited by much of the contents in each issue. Once in a while there is something stated which is a matter of opinion but is not according to the facts. Ordinarily one can overlook a mere error of information; but when the error is used as a basis of wrong argument or aspersion, it becomes tiresome if it is continued or repeated.

In recent numbers of UNITY I have noticed comparisons made between the soldiers bonus and the amount of money at the disposal of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the other corporations formed by the Government for the present assistance of banks, railroads, etc. The gist of these comments has been the same in all cases, and may be summed up by the paragraph over the initials of your name in "Jottings" on page 118 of the issue of Monday, April 25, 1932:

"A bonus of $2,000,000,000 to the soldiers seems intolerable, and we are against it. But when we remember that exactly this same stupendous sum of money was recently handed out to the bankers, how can we blame the veterans?"

1. Now, as a matter of fact, no $2,000,000,000 has been "handed out" to the bankers. The money used for the prevention of bank failures and collapse of many other banks has not amounted to $2,000,000,000.

2. The money used from these great funds, for banks, has been purely *"loans" to be repaid within one year and to be loaned on first rate security.* These are not gifts at all, and in no sense can they be called "handed out."

3. The money proposed, to the sum of $2,000,000,000 or thereabouts, to be used for the soldiers bonus, is money which, when paid to the soldiers for their "adjusted" and "deferred" rewards of service in the war, will not be returned to the Government but will be scattered in the thousand channels through which it will be used, and all trace of it will disappear.

4. The money to be loaned to the banks is not "fiat" money, but has behind it Government bonds already issued long ago, and the proper gold reserve. The money which would have to be used for a soldiers bonus at the present time would have to be printing-press money behind which was no security whatever. This money would be issued in the same way that German marks were issued after the World War; and experience has shown that once that process has started, the amount of such money which does not represent good assets is always increased because one dishonest piece of financing almost always calls for another as time goes on.

The above, in brief, is the whole matter in a nut-shell.

CLARENCE M. GALLUP.

The Northern Baptist Convention,
Providence, Rhode Island.

Cheers for Tardieu—Silence for Litvinoff
Plain Issue at Conference

Editor of UNITY:

Another revelation is on the way. An attempt to induce the Disarmament Conference to say, "We believe in reduction of armaments," prepares the way. Now we can see whether the appointed delegates on behalf of disarmament are serious and honest or not. This is the second stage of self-revelation in this Conference. The first revelation came to pass on February 25th, when the principle of total disarmament was submitted to the General Commission as basis of the Conference discussions instead of the principle of "limitation and reduction" contained in the Draft Convention. Two nations voted for the Total Disarmament thesis as basis; the others rejected it. In doing this the Conference revealed itself, and the tale of this happening has already been told.

Now, in mid-April, the events in the Conference are leading up once more to a similar revelation of the delegations here and the governments backing them. M. Litvinoff on Tuesday, April 12, made one of the best speeches of the Conference—clear in argument, radical in purpose, frank in attitude, co-operative in spirit. The point of the speech was to persuade the Conference either to stand for "real reduction" or expose itself before the world as rejecting real reduction.

Referring to the earlier proposal of the Soviet Delegation (for total disarmament) M. Litvinoff said: "Although the discussion of the Soviet proposal occupied very little of the Conference's time and its rejection still less, future historians will be bound to admit that the Conference accomplished an extremely important if negative stage of its work during the very first weeks of its existence in rejecting a problem, the solution of which would have rendered the Conference truly epoch-making and would have answered the demands and aspirations of all nations." Having reiterated the desire of his delegation for the principle of total disarmament, Litvinoff objected to "all possible attempts—and it looks as though there would be no lack of such attempts—to narrow down the task of the Conference to the limitation of armaments."

It should be remarked that the official label for the Conference is "The Conference for the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments." Public opinion calls it the Disarmament Conference and regards it as such. The present position of the Soviet Delegation is that of champion of the hopes and the faith of masses of sincere people in many parts of the world, who are increasingly disappointed and disillusioned by the faltering conduct of their own delegations now at Geneva.

The trend of public opinion in various countries, and to some extent in some quarters in Geneva itself, has recently been shown to be decidedly in favor of real disarmament. The European Youth Crusade, preaching total disarmament in France and Germany, was a notable success and found sincere support wherever it went. Another similar campaign in a part of France found the same earnest support for disarmament as the way to security. Recently in England a Church leader said: "All that the churches have so far achieved towards disarmament amounts to nothing." There are many signs that the true situation is becoming known. Blunt resolutions submitted from time to time to the Disarmament Conference compel the delegates to show their hands beyond a peradventure. Members of the general public, to which reference is so often made at the conference, can now draw their own conclusions.

Rejecting the idea of a mere limitation of armaments which would diminish neither the danger nor the horrors of war, Litvinoff proposed that the word "reduction" alone, instead of the words "limitation and reduction," be used in Article I and throughout the Draft Convention.

At the same time the Soviet delegate submitted a scheme of proportional reduction which would be an effective first step towards total disarmament, would be impartial, leaving unaltered "the existing balance of armaments, and would therefore evoke the least possible controversy." The gist of the plan submitted is as follows: Big States with armies over 200,000 would have to cut their forces by 50 per cent; those with over 170,000 by 40 per cent; and so on until the smaller armies under 30,000 might be left untouched for the time.

In direct and unambiguous language, refreshing to all people who are sincere, M. Litvinoff sums up the actual situation in the Disarmament Conference in the concluding paragraph of the important speech with which he submitted his proposals:

"The General Commission seems to have made up its mind to come to grips with the question of disarmament after the Easter vacation. Now it has to honor the bill it has issued and it will only be able to do that when it proceeds to the solution of the fundamental questions of disarmament. It must be admitted that during its first two months the Conference has but skirted these questions. It has decided only one important question, that of total disarmament, but this was, unfortunately, a negative decision. The Conference is now faced with another question of enormous importance and will have to give a straight answer to it: this question is—are the States represented ready, if only partially, to reduce, and that substantially, their armaments? If the answer is again negative it will be impossible to conceal the failure of the Conference by any side issues such as resolutions and decisions on moral disarmament, security, or even the abolition of some form of weapons or other. If, on the contrary, the problem of the substantial reduction of all armaments is solved, the States represented will have displayed their good will sufficiently to prevent problems of lesser importance from constituting any sort of difficulty."

The plain man in the street now knows what is happening in the "Conference for the Limitation and Reduction of Armaments," which some people are endeavoring to turn into a Disarmament Conference. This week, when M. Tardieu made a long and clever speech in favour of retaining present armaments and of erecting into the bargain an international super-army, he was applauded. The clear, able, straightforward speech of M. Litvinoff bluntly proposing the fairest conceivable form of proportionate reduction was received in absolute silence.

DONALD GRANT.

Geneva, Switzerland.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 178)

bearing their burden of costly or simple presents and cakes and sweets. In these eastern European countries human hearts become very generous at this season, and while organized charity becomes more and more needed, yet everyone who can gives money or gifts to the needy and to the rather numerous beggars and cripples.

My thoughts turned to those inmates of the local prison in the center of the town and I found there a number of men and women and youthful offenders who in many cases had known little or nothing of the spirit of the Christ or of human sympathy or brotherhood (so prevalent at Christmas). I found the prison well managed and prisoners were there of all kinds and of several nationalities. Permission was granted me by the kindly governor to go there on New Year's morning and distribute cigarettes to the men and a small money gift to buy a little extra bread to the women. Being a non-smoker myself, I realized that for these folks who are accustomed to smoke, the greatest pleasure is a cigarette. In the town I was able to buy packets of cigarettes cheaply as tobacco is grown in the country; and so I went to the prison with a large quantity and also many small coins for distribution. In passing I might add that money for a special prison visiting fund had been given me by an English Quakeress, by an American lady and by the

London Friends Council for Social Service.

When I arrived at the prison I felt at first the wardens thought me a strange being to be interested in prisoners in a foreign land (as friendly visitors are so rare and the governor told me I was the most frequent visitor), but soon they entered into the spirit of the day and fully understood the brotherly touch in the act. As I walked from cell to cell I first gave the warden cigarettes and then the prisoners, and soon the wardens were lighting the cigarettes of the prisoners and a friendly and human spirit prevailed and much humor and conversation. We all forgot our ranks and positions in the happiness of the scene. The corridors were full of the friendly fumes. In one waiting room were four newly arrived men under arrest for a quarrel. They looked very angry and resentful with each other and did not want to speak together. I gave the cigarettes to the youngest of them and told him to divide them. His look was very sour and I thought he would return my gift. But he felt the spirit of the place and then handed the cigarettes to the other three, and all laughed at each other, and as they smoked I saw them later chatting among themselves, for there was for the time a freer atmosphere.

Each man received several cigarettes and as we left the men's section happiness and smoke filled the building, and at least each man felt himself part of the human family and no longer despised and rejected on the New Year's day.

On arriving at the women's wards I found the smoke had preceded us and when I saw in some of the cells a group of local gipsy women (the most inveterate of women smokers to be found anywhere) they looked pictures of joy and expectancy. As I told them I intended to give them all a small coin to buy a little extra white bread, they said, "Better tobacco than bread, please; we can live without bread, but not without tobacco." After rebuking them for being so modern and following the fashion of their day, they received not only cigarettes but also the coin as intended. Then they began to chatter as gipsy folk can and the sound followed us right round the corridors. Wardens and prisoners seemed for the time to be more understanding of each other.

For little expense and with little trouble one had brought some hope and brotherhood into nearly 140 lives and perhaps made this New Year's day one which would stir some of the prisoners to hope of a better way of life and a feeling that society is not their enemy but that at least a section of mankind, small though it may be at present, desires not merely punishment, but redemption and a return to citizenship. Owing to the difficult economic conditions prevailing in some countries in Europe today, many prisoners are the victims of unemployment, poverty and after-war evils and injustices. Some of the very poorest go to prison to pass the winter months and avoid cold and hunger. It is surely better to leave outside the prison walls any note of despair, or mere utterances of "Repent ye, Repent ye," and to enter with the Christ spirit of fellowship. "Ye are all my friends if ye follow the Godlike within you." Therefore at the season of Christmas and New Year, we may surely bid the prisoners rejoice and bid them feel part of the human family of God on earth.

FREDERICK HANKINSON.

Budapest, Hungary.

TO UNITY READERS

Greetings from a like minded person who has a delightful country place on the East shore of Lake Michigan which she would like to share with you.

One hundred or more people can be accommodated—an ideal spot for group conferences on social questions. If interested write—

ERMINA MOORE
Syringa Bluff South Haven, Mich.

La Follette's
Great National Weekly Newspaper
THE PROGRESSIVE
Subscription Price $1.50 Per Year

In every issue it is fighting your battles against monopoly and organized wealth in government

SPECIAL OFFER
3 Months
— 12 — ISSUES 20c

STARTLING facts suppressed by other papers will be revealed in the next few issues. Send 20 cents today and be sure to receive the next extraordinarily interesting issues of La Follette's great weekly newspaper.
The Progressive, Dept. B., Madison, Wis.

Just Out

A Charming Gift Book

THE HEART OF SCOTT'S POETRY

A Selection of the Best Poetry
of Sir Walter Scott
With a Critical Introduction,
By
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

This beautiful volume was prepared and published in recognition of the Scott Centenary (1832-1932)

Price $2.50

Order of your bookseller or of the publishers

Oxford University Press
114 Fifth Avenue New York City

The May-June issue of

The New Humanist

Containing:

OF THEE I SING
by Frank Lloyd Wright

TWO SONNETS
by Hugh Robert Orr

DOCTRINAL FUNCTIONS AND RELIGIOUS DOCTRINES
By Cassius J. Keyser

A NEW MIDWESTERN FRONTIERSMAN
by E. T. Knower

A STUDENT OF DILTHEY
by Hans-Joachim Schoeps

TRAGIC AMERICA
by Carl Henry Grabo

SPECIAL OFFER

The New Humanist ($1.00 yearly; 20c a copy) will be sent in combination with any of the following books at reduced prices (regular price of book in brackets) The New Humanist for one year

With: Sir James Jeans "The Mysterious Universe" ($1.00)—$1.65
With: Norman Thomas, "As I See It" ($2.00) $2.50
With Twenty-two Authors "Living Philosophies" ($2.50)—$2.75
With: Curtis Reese "Humanist Religion" ($1.00)—$1.65
With: A. E. Haydon "The Quest of the Ages" ($2.50)—$3.00
With: Walter Lippmann "A Preface to Morals" ($1.00)—$1.65

If book you want is not listed here, send for prices. Please send check or money order, otherwise books will be mailed C. O. D. All orders must be placed with

THE NEW HUMANIST
14 West First Street, Dayton, Ohio